

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 have been amended. Claims 2, 5 and 8 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,907,569 (Glance). Claims 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glance in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,175 (Frosberg). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the following arguments.

Regarding the rejections of dependent claims 2, 5 and 8, these rejections are moot, since these claims have been cancelled.

Regarding independent claims 1, 3, and 6, these claims have been amended for clarity to recite a “light emitting device drive circuit for driving a printing plate producing apparatus which has a light emitting device for emitting a laser beam for scanning a photosensitive material placed in an exposing section along both a primary scanning direction and a secondary scanning direction and exposing an image on a photosensitive material, [and] controls an intensity of light when the light emitting device starts a primary scanning to keep a predetermined value. These amendments are supported, for example, at paragraphs [0019], [0020], [0021], [0022], and [0026] of the present application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3 and 6 have been further amended to recite “a light receiving device for receiving the laser beam emitted from the light emitting device” and “a control section for performing an auto power control based on an intensity of light received by the light receiving device, and for generating the input signal using a blanking area where the light emitting device does not perform the primary scanning, so that the intensity of light when the light emitting device starts the primary scanning is the predetermined value”. Support for these amendments is

found, for example, at paragraphs [0020] and [0026] et seq., of the present application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 3 and 6 have also been amended to recite “the resistance value R of the resistor is obtained using an equation:

$$R = (V_a - V_b) / (i_b - i)$$

where (i<sub>b</sub>-i) represents an amount of change of current supplied to the light emitting device, wherein the amount of change of current supplied to the light emitting device is required for keeping the intensity of light output by the light emitting device constant with a temperature change of the light emitting device caused by a light emitted therefrom in a single primary scanning time period with the light emitting device being provided alone, and (V<sub>a</sub>-V<sub>b</sub>) represents an amount by which the light emitting device has its forward voltage reduced in accordance with the temperature change of the light emitting device caused by the light emitted therefrom in the single primary scanning time period with the light emitting device being provided alone when the current supplied to the light emitting device is constant.”

This amendment is fully supported, for example, at paragraphs [0033] to [0039] of the present application. No new matter has been added.

The claimed invention relates to printing plate production technology which exposes an image on a printing plate using a laser beam emitted from a light emitting device. The claimed invention strictly controls an intensity of light emission using an auto power control (APC). Additionally, the resistance value R does not vary with a temperature change of the recited resistor; that is, the recited equation for obtaining the resistance value R does not include a coefficient that varies in accordance with a temperature change of the resistor.

Regarding the anticipation rejection of amended independent claim 1 based on Glance, this reference does not disclose or even suggest the claimed control section for performing an auto power control (APC), or the claimed resistor having a resistance value  $R$ . In the field of printing plate production technology, when the intensity of light emission varies, the image quality produced by the printing plate accordingly deteriorates. Therefore, in this field, the intensity of the light emission is strictly controlled in order to stabilize it. The claimed invention uses the recited control section to perform APC to strictly control intensity, and also provides the resistor having the resistance value  $R$ .

In contrast, in the field of communication technology, where Glance is used, it is not necessary to control the intensity of light emission as strictly. Generally, in the field of communication technology, it is sufficient to determine whether light is being emitted or not. Furthermore, Glance teaches that an object of his invention is not to use complex and expensive active power regulators (see column 1, line 43). Therefore, the claimed APC is not taught or even suggested in Glance.

Furthermore, in the field of printing plate production, which requires strict control of intensity of light emission, the resistance of the resistor used in the claimed light emitting drive circuit has a small temperature dependency. In contrast, Glance relates to a technology which positively utilizes a resistance value that varies greatly with the temperature of the resistor. The resistor taught by Glance is a thermistor or a varistor, whose resistance value has a large temperature dependency. The recited resistor of claim 1 is therefore completely different from that used in Glance's device.

Glance does not anticipate amended claim 1, because it does not disclose each and every element of that claim. In particular, Glance does not disclose the claimed control section or

resistor. Moreover, Glance teaches that the object of their invention is not to use active power regulators, such as the claimed control section. Still further, in Glance's field of communication, strict control of the intensity of light emission is not required. Therefore, it would not be obvious for those skilled in the art to modify Glance to include the claimed control section and the claimed resistor to yield the invention of amended claim 1.

Consequently, amended independent claim 1 is patentable.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of amended independent claims 3 and 6 based on Glance and Forsberg, the Forsberg reference does not furnish the above-discussed features of claims 1, 3 and 6 (i.e., the control section and the resistor) missing from Glance. Forsberg relates to the field of communications. Therefore, in Forsberg, the time period during which a light emitting device emits light is very short. As a result, the temperature change of the light emitting device is small, and the forward voltage applied to the light emitting device rarely changes in response to the temperature change of the light emitting device. Therefore, the resistance value of Forsberg cannot be determined based on the recited equation  $R = (V_a - V_b) / (i_b - i)$  of the present invention, since  $(V_a - V_b)$  is substantially zero. Consequently, the resistance value of Forsberg must be determined differently from that of the resistance value  $R$  of the claimed invention.

Since neither Glance nor Forsberg teach or suggest the claimed control section or resistor, any combination of these references, however made, would still be missing these important claimed features, and it would not have been obvious to add these features to any Glance/Forsberg combination.

Consequently, amended independent claims 3 and 6 are patentable, as are claims 4 and 7, which depend from claims 3 and 6, respectively.

Applicant notes that claims 4 and 7 have been amended to recite "the drive current supplied to the light emitting device ... is greater than a drive current supplied after the rising response delay period has passed". These amendments are supported, for example, in FIG. 6 and the corresponding description of the present application. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina  
Registration No. 33,424

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM:llg  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: September 25, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**